

CHARLES RAY ROBINSON §
v. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:14cv764
DIRECTOR, TDCJ-CID §

The Petitioner Charles Robinson, proceeding *pro se*, filed this application for the writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. §2254 complaining of the legality of his conviction. This Court ordered that the matter be referred to the United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1) and (3) and the Amended Order for the Adoption of Local Rules for the Assignment of Duties to United States Magistrate Judges.

After review of the pleadings and the state court records, the magistrate judge issued a report recommending that the petition be dismissed. No objections were filed to the report; consequently, the parties are barred from *de novo* review by the district judge of those findings, conclusions, and recommendations and, except upon grounds of plain error, from appellate review of the unobjected-to proposed factual findings and legal conclusions accepted and adopted by the district court. *Douglass v. United Services Automobile Association*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (*en banc*).

1

United States v. Wilson, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918, 109 S.Ct. 3243 (1989) (where no objections to a magistrate judge's report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law.") It is accordingly

ORDERED that the report of the magistrate judge (docket no. 17) is **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the District Court. It is further


ORDERED that the above-styled application for the writ of habeas corpus is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**. It is further

ORDERED that the Petitioner Charles Robinson is denied a certificate of appealability *sua sponte*. Finally, it is

ORDERED that any and all motions which may be pending in this action are hereby **DENIED**.

It is **SO ORDERED**.

SIGNED this 7th day of May, 2015.


MICHAEL H. SCHNEIDER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE